



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ously ill, Grant extended Lee's parole that he might leave Lexington, Virginia, for the bedside of his child. It was in recognition of this generous act, and in what proved to be the last communication between the two great generals, that General Lee expressed his obligation to "the General Commanding the Armies of the United States for his kind consideration." Writing from Raleigh, North Carolina, to his wife, under date of April 25, 1865, and pointing out that the people were anxious to see peace restored, "so that further devastation need not take place in the country," Grant said: "The suffering that must exist in the South the next year, even if the war ended now, will be beyond conception. People who talk of further retaliation and punishment, except of the political leaders, either do not conceive of the suffering endured already or they are heartless and unfeeling and wish to stay at home out of danger while the punishment is being inflicted." One familiar with General Grant's magnanimous attitude toward the South, his fearless opposition to the vindictive feeling of President Johnson toward that stricken land, can easily understand how Mrs. Jefferson Davis could write to him in May, 1866, and say, "All know you ever as good as well as great, merciful as well as brave."

But there is something more pertinent to our inquiry, and nearer at hand. When, on April 2, 1917, President Wilson, speaking at a joint session of the two houses of Congress, recommended the "declaration of a state of war between the United States and the German Imperial Government," he saw fit to say: "We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling toward them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their government acted in entering this war. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. It was a war determined upon as wars used to be determined upon in the old, unhappy days, when peoples were nowhere consulted by their rulers and wars were provoked and waged in the interest of dynasties or of little groups of ambitious men, who were accustomed to use their fellow-men as pawns and tools." So far as we know, our President has never repudiated these sentiments. In the light of them, we ask again, When will it be proper for the American people to recall the sentiment of that other, and we are sure we may say greater, interpreter of the American spirit, who gave to us the immortal phrase, "with malice toward none"?

When can we call attention again to the fact that there can be no international peace until all the nations, including the Central Powers, accept a common point of view and join willingly in that one legitimate struggle of struggles, the conflict of man against the common enemies of man?

## THE WORLD PEACE MOVEMENT

**T**HE world peace movement, which before the war had attained unto proportions which challenged the militarists the world over as they had never been challenged before, a movement which indeed had goaded the warriors into exhibitions of infuriated self assertion as their only means of self preservation, is seen coming out of the war tempered and vindicated. All its followers are buckling on their armors of righteousness again and preparing for another onslaught upon the iniquitous system of war, a system which after a trial of five frightful years stands before the bar of humanity in all its ghastliness and guilt. The mood of the world is changing; has changed. In both hemispheres there is endless disillusionment. Writers everywhere are pleading for the abolition of war. Followers of Mr. Wilson's carelessly conceived League of Nations accept that plan anxiously with the hope that it may be the means of ending war. Any brave gesture, even by willful and incompetent hands such as gave to us the proposed League of Nations, the League to Enforce Peace, a Holy Alliance, would naturally in the present temper of the world secure a large following. As after the wars ending in 1815, the world was sick of the whole beastly business, so again the world demands some means of preventing such outbursts of international insanity, and the average man doesn't care much what they are, if only they are aimed at the overthrow of war.

Out of the blur of counsel, men are finding again the pearls in the peace movement which they thought had been swallowed up in war. Writers like Frank H. Simonds realize that "indemnities" and "securities" set up under the terms of the treaty at Versailles can never indemnify or secure without a peace of real reconciliation. Undefeated Germanism, especially outside Germany, a Russia outside the society of nations, liberated Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Jugo-Slavia, Rumania, Italian acquisitions, irridientia in Greece, Asia, Africa, and in the islands everywhere all present situations demanding a new birth of that rational good-will which characterizes the center of the peace movement.

"Sanitary cordons" and Prinkipo proposals cannot make the world safe for democracy, or democracy safe for the world. The chief breeder of war is that group of aggressive ideals, traditions, and ambitions, which for the want of a better word we call militarism. The chief breeder of peace is that group of rational ideals, traditions, and ambitions which for the want of a better name we call justice; and justice, the goal of liberty under the rule of law, is the essence of the peace movement.

Anarchy and disorder have had their day; the time of law and order is returning. The peace movement is

welcomed again increasingly, for the health and life of the world require it. As Novicow would have said if he were with us again, dissociation with its toll of death must give way now to association with its way of life. This association means to the accredited peace workers a further evolution of law by the Society of Nations, not by an alliance of the powerful against the weak, but by all the civilized nations composing the Society of Nations, quite as they went about the business in the Hague Peace Conference of 1907, in the Universal Postal Union since 1906, in the Pan-American Union since 1890. Only a German such as Mommsen could have defined the Hague Conference as "a false conception of universal history." No one can ignore the universal Postal Union, to which all civilized nations and self-governing dominions have been parties for nearly two decades. No one can ignore the Pan-American Union, often referred to as an illustration of what a rational international organization can accomplish, especially so referred to by the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, Alfred H. Fried, and by the scholarly Alpheus H. Snow in the present number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*. A union of the nations, by which we do not mean the abolition of States, is a necessity on every ground, political, industrial, biological. Spoilation, the essence of war, despoils the despoiled and the despoiler, thus violating the law of life. War has demonstrated again not only its hideousness but its utter impossibility if the race is to endure. As a recent writer in the *Atlantic Monthly* puts it:

"The idea of war has revealed itself in its full hideousness. All the world has come to look upon it as a sort of mythological monster which, if left to itself, will periodically re-emerge from hell, to devour the whole youth and the whole wealth of civilized mankind. It is useless to dream of clipping the wings or paring the claws of the dragon. It must be slain outright if it is not to play unthinkable havoc with civilization; and to that end the intelligence and the moral enthusiasm of the world are now, as we see, addressing themselves."

It is to this job that the peace workers have always addressed themselves, do now address themselves, and will continue to address themselves.

## The Peace Movement a Practical Thing

THE peace movement is not an abstract thing. It is very concrete, facing a real world situation. The decision of the United States to withdraw all of its troops from Siberia; the indecision of the government of Japan as to whether it will assume the task of policing Siberia and blocking, perchance, further advance of the Bolshevik armies; the perturbation of the British Government over the steady advance of the Bolshevik forces in Central Asia in their drive through to India and the Indian Ocean; the decision of the Supreme

Council in Paris to permit a modification of the blockade against Soviet Russia—all these are significant signs of the times.

They hint at western Europe's and America's tardy recognition of the fact that their joint program of attempting to force upon Russia a policy which a majority of Russians do not accept has broken down, and that they now have to face a militant Slavic power. Having established itself internally, it is out for conquest, in part by use of military power, but more especially by resort to propaganda in behalf of a new yet old theory of the State, adopting a scale of expenditure in marshalled propaganda of men and money such as never has been known before.

The consequence of this propaganda of ideas, emanating from Moscow as a center, is that there is scarcely a nation in the world now, on any continent, that has the same sense of security in its post-war or war form of government that it had when the war with Germany closed. A new war of greater magnitude impends, sometimes only domestic and civil in form, but in other cases likely to take on the forms of international strife, though in substance always a war between classes. Obviously the gravity of this situation can hardly be overstated. It weakens in a corroding way the hands of statesmen and jurists accustomed to deal with such problems on the basis of unity, at least within national lines. Winston Churchill, for instance, representative of the aristocracy and the ruling classes in Great Britain for many centuries, would have the British armies at once massed in western and central Asia, to save British imperial interests. But the British Labor leaders have let it be known that such a policy will be fought by them and by the coming dominant element of the electors; and the Premier sides with Labor.

Precisely the same situation exists in France, Italy, and the United States. The masses of no country today, after the experience of the war with Germany and Austria and after the disclosures of "secret diplomacy" prior to and at the Paris Peace Conference, will go forth to fight the Russian masses in behalf of a theory of society that many of them believe is the parent of war and that has been such for generations.

That the Russian masses wish to go on fighting for an indefinite time in behalf of their soviet form of government, as a form, is doubtful. Inherently they are a pacific people. That in due time, as Baron Korff points out in his article on page 16, elements of the Russian population not formerly recognized now by Lenin and Trotsky, will count in making the Russia of the future, we have no doubt. But it is very clear that the Allies' policy toward Russia from 1914 up to the present time has been lacking in insight, consistency, and sympathy. She, like other nations, must in the last analysis, be

self-determining in her rights and State functions. But she has no more sanction for imposing her theory of the State, by use of force, on other peoples than Germany had, or than Great Britain has now. Nor can she enter the brotherhood of nations governed by law unless she quits crafty tactics of propaganda that deny law and assert anarchy. Continuance of this policy will array against her the moral, financial, and police power of genuine "internationalists" so long as she follows it.

Organizations and individuals dedicated to the peace cause and to creation of international agencies rooted in conceptions of law and fraternal national relations, need squarely to face the fact that with the emergence of the issue of a class-war over so large an area of the world, and also owing to the intensified claims of "nationalism" as over against "internationalism," they have a more difficult era ahead of them than they have known within the memory of this generation.

Nevertheless this is not a time for disheartening apathy or uncertainty, but rather one calling for hope and candor and wisdom; for whatever else may or may not be true about the future, the fact is apparent that militant minorities, in and out of governments, are not going to lead the masses into conflict as they have in the past. The peace cause, from being the irenicism of the "intellectuals," the pietists, the jurists, and the disillusioned statesman of the world, has become the slogan of the efficiently organized body of workers. With such a backing the peace movement may be looked to as a natural and an inevitable expression of a world longing.

### The Old-Line Peace Workers

WHAT may be called the old-line peace workers, "pacifists" before the word became synonymous with "traitors," are, following the war, reorganizing themselves both in this country and abroad. The seventy-odd peace societies affiliated before the war with the American Peace Society are not all quiescent or dead. The Carnegie Endowment continues on its course, supplying through its publications invaluable knowledge on international affairs of a legal, economic, and educational nature. The League to Enforce Peace, the World Peace Foundation, and the Church Peace Union are concentrating their efforts primarily upon the acceptance of the League of Nations as proposed by the Treaty of Versailles. The Woman's Peace Party is now to be known as the Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom, Section for United States. The American School Peace League has been reorganized under a new name. The Peace Committee of the National Woman's Council is working; the League of Nations Union somewhat; also the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union. The Fellowship of Reconciliation and the

Quakers continue their intelligent attempts to give a Christian interpretation to the international situation. Then there is the Pan-American Union, always an inspiration; the Societies of International Law, and the chastened government agencies.

Abroad we note that the German Peace Society not only still survives, but that it is active; and that the new League of Nations Union in that country is printing many valuable papers. Beside the League of Nations Unions in England, France, and other European countries, the ancient Peace Society of England persists. Mr. F. Maddison continues to edit *The Arbitrator*, organ of the International Arbitration League; Mr. Fried continues publishing *Friedens Warte* in Zurich; *La Vita Internazionale*, founded by E. T. Moneta, continues to be published in Milan under the direction of Arnaldo Agnelli; while in France, under the direction of such men as M. Th. Ruysen, M. J. Prudhommeaux, M. J.-L. Puech, M. Auguste Laune, M. Charles Richet, M. Jacques Dumas, and others, *La Paix par le Droit*, published regularly through the war, continues, fortunately, to arrive regularly.

In Holland, upon the initiative of pre-war workers for peace, there is an attempt to organize a union in support of the League of Nations and the peace, called *Vereeniging Voor Volkerenbond en Vrede*. The aim of this union is the further advance and development of the League of Nations as an organization based on international law, generally disseminating the principles of peace and combating those of war; also the promotion of every endeavor to weld into one the various peace organizations in the world. This union represents something of an outgrowth of the "*Vrede door Recht*," which began in 1871, of several other Dutch organizations of a more or less political or religious complexion, and of the emergency war federation known as the *Nederlandsche Anti-Oorlog Raad*. But the proposed "union" is wholly new, being backed not only by men familiar to long-time peace workers, but by men new in our councils.

Unfortunately this attempt to amalgamate in Holland the various peace agencies of the world seems to be in conflict with the *Bureau Internationale de la Paix*, with headquarters at Berne. From this distance it would seem that the attempt in Holland to draw to a new organization the peace groups that have long adhered to this International Bureau of Peace at Berne is unfortunate. It is true that the Berne Bureau aligned itself against the Central Powers during the war, on the theory that it believed it necessary to base peace upon right. Our judgment is that the various peace societies of the world, including those of Holland and, indeed, of the Central Powers, will do well to remember the consistent and effective work of the *Bureau Internationale de la Paix* at Berne and work through it toward that

united effort which ought logically to follow the splendid effort that expressed itself in the long line of brave international peace congresses, the twentieth of which was held in 1913 at the Hague. Our readers will be interested to know, in this connection, that the Council of the *Bureau* decided at its session last September to call an assembly of the delegates of L'Union Internationale des Sociétés de la Paix within the next few months.

From such facts and from the work of the American Peace Society, familiar to the readers of this magazine, it should be clear that the peace movement survives. Discussion over the League of Nations has created an informed body of opinion that may change the peace movement; but it will improve it. When we recall that the modern peace movement is an expression of the reaction of the popular will against the wars brought to an end in 1815 by the Council at Vienna, it is reasonable to expect, especially in the light of over a century of consecrated peace effort, that the peace movement will during the next generation be a much more constructive and effective thing than we are able now fully to realize. Ten million dead boys, slaughtered for us, call from out their too early graves that that may be.

CREDIT the Sultan of Turkey with his primacy in one respect if in no other. He is the first sovereign of a State that fought against the Allied and Associated Powers who has formally admitted in an address to his own people that his nation erred in the alliance with Germany.

ON JANUARY 17 they took the five sheets of ancient parchment, on which are written the Constitution of the United States, out of their steel and glass encasement in the State Department. They photographed them for the use of newspapers and motion-picture filmmakers in carrying on an "Americanization" campaign to offset anti-American propaganda. It is estimated that 50,000,000 people in this way will have their attention called to the basic principles of American republicanism. We hope that they will, and that they will give especial attention to the Bill of Rights, some of which are now in peril by the policy of the government itself. Pressure of public opinion on Congress is leading it to a retreat, we are glad to say.

REV. DR. G. CAMPBELL MORGAN, the English preacher now in the United States, says that whenever a great country banishes strong drink it must prepare for a revolution, since when the masses stop being sodden with liquor they begin to think and act; and he predicts that London will first be in peril from her masses

when prohibition comes. Ray Stannard Baker, investigating conditions in Gary, Indiana, and interpreting the situation there, says that prohibition has encouraged economic unrest, for it has "removed the great deadener of human trouble and human ambition—alcohol—and has left time to the workers to talk and meet and read, and with money to buy publications and to support organizations." Thus we have the paradoxical claim that a sober world makes a revolting world, and that many persons who are economic conservatives, by their ethical radicalism are unconsciously laying mines under their own houses.

VISCOUNT GREY, British statesman, conversing with Prince Lichnowsky, the German ambassador at London, in July, 1914, said, "No matter what may be the result of the great European war, the collapse of monarchies will follow, industry and commerce will be destroyed, and the power of capital undermined. Revolutions, as in 1848, will take place." The Prince reported this prophecy to the Berlin Foreign Office; it found its way to the Kaiser for his all highest scrutiny, and he margined the document "Useless." We know this now through the revelations of the Kautsky-edited German White Book. In terms of medicine's technical speech, we must admit that Grey was a shrewd diagnostician.

ONE effect of the war and the change in condition of some of the "smaller peoples" of Europe has been seemingly to make unnecessary continuance in the United States of The League of Small and Subject Nationalities, and it has dissolved; but many of its former supporters and some of its former officials have promptly organized a League of Oppressed Peoples, unfortunately.

"Oppressed peoples," like the "poor," are likely to be with us for some time to come. The forms of tyranny change and may exist under soviet as under Romanoff rule of Russia. It has to be a spiritual new birth, a radical change of governmental purpose, a sincere disposition to show good-will, an utter belief in the capacity of all men to rule themselves well ultimately, that ever checks oppression of one race by another, of one nation by another, of one class by another. These are old-fashioned opinions for very modernistic and revolutionary days. Many statesmen and many voters who keep these statesmen in power do not have such words as "spirit," "good-will," and "equality" in their working vocabulary. They will use them in state papers, in orations before popular assemblies, and in cabinet discussions possibly, but they rarely get into executive decrees or laws.